

### **REMARKS**

The present Amendment is in response to the Examiner's Office Action mailed January 7, 2005. Claims 18-23, 28-32, and 36 are cancelled, claims 1, 33, and 62 are amended, and new claims 69-80 are added. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-11, 33-35, 37-62, 64, 65, and 69-80 are now pending in view of the above amendments. Of these, claims 8-11 and 50-54 stand withdrawn.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicant's remarks are presented in the order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

Please note that the following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any cited references and the claimed invention. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claimed invention and the cited references. In addition, Applicants request that the Examiner carefully review any references discussed below to ensure that Applicants' understanding and discussion of the references, if any, is consistent with the Examiner's understanding.

#### **I. ELECTION/RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

Applicants acknowledge that claims 8-11 and 50-54 stand withdrawn at present. Applicants respectfully request rejoinder of the non-elected claims upon the allowance of a generic or linking claim.

#### **II. PRIOR ART REJECTIONS**

##### **A. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner rejects claims 1-3, 5, 7, 33-49, 55-62 and 64-65 under 35 U.S.C. § 103a as being unpatentable over *Noddings, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,574,814). Applicants traverse this

rejection for obviousness on the grounds that the references – either individually or in combination – fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the rejected claims.

As seen in Figures 6, 7A, 7B, and 14A-14F, for example, *Noddings* discloses an assembly wherein an optical device 115 in a cavity is connected to electrical devices outside the cavity by devices inside the cavity, including: a flex wire 116, electrical circuit components 131, and wire assembly 130. The cavity is defined by a multipart structure including seal ring 132, lid 128, substrate 129, connector body 117, et al.

In direct contrast, present claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

a first housing having a body with an outer surface and an inner surface and extending around said chip and fixed relative to said window, said first housing having one or more electrical terminals along its outer surface that are electrically connected, through the body via an embedded trace in the housing, to at least one electrical terminal along the inner surface of the housing; and

at least one terminal of said chip being bump bonded to a first conductive trace on said window, and at least one said electrical terminal along the inner surface of the housing bump bonded to said first conductive trace on said window.

By way of example from the foregoing, *Noddings* does not teach or suggest “said first housing having one or more electrical terminals along its outer surface that are electrically connected through the body via an embedded trace in the housing to at least one electrical terminal along the inner surface of the housing” as is presently claimed. Rather, although *Noddings* teaches a conductive path, *Noddings* does not teach or suggest an embedded trace configured as is claimed.

Similarly, present claim 33 recites, *inter alia*: “a conductive path embedded in said housing from the at least one conductive trace to an at least one pad on an external surface of said housing.” Present claim 62 recites, *inter alia*: “said first housing having at least one electrical terminal along its outer surface, which is electrically connected by an embedded electrical path through the body of the first housing to at least one electrical terminal along the inner surface of the first housing.”

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to set forth a *prima facie* case for obviousness as to the independent claims 1, 33, and 62 and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

## II. NEW CLAIMS

Claims 69-80 have been added and correspond generally (differing as indicated below) to former claims 12-17 and 24-27. Claims 12-17 and 24-27 were previously cancelled to obtain the allowance of this case. Because the case was not allowed as believed, the subject matter of former claims 12-17 and 24-27 is now reintroduced. As these claims were previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103a as being unpatentable over *Nemoto, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,025,213), the following comments are presented related to these earlier rejections.

*Nemoto* discloses a device package having a light emitting device 31 attached to a window 32 by a resin adhesive 48. An electrical signal is communicated from outside the structure to device 31 via electrode pad 42, interconnection pattern 41 and solder layer 43A. *Nemoto* does not disclose an electrically conductive path through a housing attached to the light emitting device 31. Rather, *Nemoto* discloses the conductive path along the window surface and through window 32 (Fig. 14F).

In direct contrast, present claim 69 recites, *inter alia*: “a first housing having a body, an electrically conductive internal pad, an electrical path connected to said internal pad and embedded in said body, and an electrically conductive external pad connected to said electrical path.” Present claim 74 recites, *inter alia*: “said housing having a body with at least one conductor extending on an embedded path from an inner surface of the housing at the hermetically sealed enclosure to an outer surface of the housing.” Present claim 78 recites, *inter alia*: “said housing being monolithic and having at least one electrical terminal along its outer surface, which is electrically connected through the body via an embedded trace in the housing to at least one electrical terminal along the inner surface of the housing.” Finally, present claim 80 recites, *inter alia*, “said housing having at least one electrical terminal along its outer surface,

which is electrically connected through an embedded path in the body of the housing to at least one electrical terminal along the inner surface of the housing.”

Accordingly, for at least the reason that *Nemoto* does not teach or suggest conductive paths as presently claimed. The prompt allowance of the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe the claims as amended are in allowable form. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, or which may be overcome by an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 9th day of May, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,



WILLIAM J. ATHAY  
Registration No. 44,515  
Attorney for Applicant  
Customer No. 022913  
Telephone: (801) 533-9800